

10/733,539

4

REMARKS

The examiner rejected the claims under 112 since the coaxial slit ring claim was not shown on the specification.

The application has been amended to replace the word coaxial with parallel axis, since the split rings are not coaxial as was claimed but clearly have parallel axis.

This amendment overcomes the 112 objection since the written description and the drawings clearly show parallel axis of the split rings.

The examiner did not give any weight to the coaxial split ring limitation in the last office action. The claim has been amended to show the split rings as having parallel axis. Which is clearly shown in the specification and drawings.

The examiner rejected claims 1 as being obvious over Kobacker in view of the two brothers racing catalog page 77.

Claim 1 has been amended to add the feature of the both split rings being on parallel axis.

The application is for a handlebar having two pieces, the handlebar and the riser pipe. The two spit rings with parallel axis allows the double split ring piece to rotate independently of both the fork and the riser pipe. The second split ring axis being parallel to the first split ring axis allows the riser pipe that is attached to the handlebar to be both aligned with and able to be moved parallel and vertically with the fork, independent of the double split ring for operation as an extension of the forks for infinite adjustability of the handlebars. The double split ring with parallel axis allows the fork and the riser pipe to be moved independently of each other in both the horizontal and vertical planes.

Claim 1 has been amended to add the feature of the both split rings having parallel axis. This feature is not shown in the prior art and is important for adjusting the clamp vertically on the fork tube and for adjusting the handlebar column vertically on the clamp to provide for a wide range of adjustment positions for the handlebar. The prior art does not allow for the vertical adjustments in this manner. In Kobacker the first split ring aperture is perpendicular to the second split ring thereby limiting the vertical adjustment to the position

10/733,539

5

of the clamp on the fork tube. The handlebar cannot be vertically adjusted on the clamp thereby limiting its vertical range.

Claim 1, as amended, has a feature not found in the prior art and is therefore allowable.

Since the prior art in combination does not have these features and does not provide the advantages of the invention the invention is not obvious and should be allowed.

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected as being obvious further in view of Newkirk.

Since claim 1 has been shown to be allowable dependent claim 2 is allowable as is claim 3, which has the claimed elements of claim 1.